DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 286 265 EA 019 651

TITLE	Leaders for America's Schools. The Report of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration.
INSTITUTION	University Council for Educational Administration, Tempe, AZ.
PUB DATE	87
NOTE	65p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Education; *Administrator Role; College School Cooperation; *Educational Administration; *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Females; Higher Education; *Leadership Qualities; Minority Groups; Principals; Superintendents
IDENTIFIERS	*National Commission Reports

ABSTRACT

A revolution in education will require unusually competent, skilled, visionary leadership. This report examines the quality of educational leadership in the United States, focusing on the roles of principals and superintendents. According to recent research, the educational administration field lacks: (1) a definition of good educational leadership; (2) leadership recruitment programs in the schools; (3) collaboration between school districts and universities; (4) minority and women administrators; (5) systematic professional development for administrators; (6) high quality candidates and preparation programs relevant to job demands; (7) licensure programs promoting excellence; (8) national cooperation in preparing school leaders; and (9) sequence, modern content, and clinical experiences in preparation programs. The report aims to restructure school administration. Separate chapters outline recommendations for public schools, professional organizations, universities, state and federal policymakers, and the private sector. Significant recommendations include: (1) redefining educational leadership; (2) establishing a National Policy Board on Educational Administration; (3) modeling administration preparation programs after those of other professional schools; (4) terminating at least 300 college and university educational administration programs; (5) initiating recruitment and placement programs for minorities and women; (6) requiring public schools' full partnership in preparing administrators; (7) creating management development opportunities; and (8) reforming licensure programs. Included are numerous references and a list of commissioned papers. (MLH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED286265

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Patrick B. Forsyth
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

LEADERS FOR AMERICA'S SCHOOLS

The Report of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration

EA019651

LEADERS FOR AMERICA'S SCHOOLS

The Report of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration

The National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration was sponsored by the University Council for Educational Administration, a consortium of fifty leading research universities having doctoral programs in school leadership. For thirty years UCEA has sought the improvement of administrator preparation through interuniversity cooperation.

Generous financial support for the work of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration was provided by:

Arizona State University
The Association of Colleges and Schools of Education in State and Land Grant Colleges and Affiliated Private Universities
The Danforth Foundation
The Ford Foundation
The Johnson Foundation
The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation
The University Council for Educational Administration
New York University
The Spring Hill Foundation

Financial support for this project does not constitute endorsement by these foundations, associations, or their memberships.

© The University Council for Educational Administration, 1987

Contents

Commission Members vi

Acknowledgements ix

Significant Recommendations xiii

Preface xv

1. A Vision of School Leadership 1
2. What Public Schools Should Do 9
3. What Professional Organizations Should Do 13
4. What Universities Should Do 17
5. What State Policymakers Should Do 25
6. What Federal Policymakers Should Do 31
7. What the Private Sector Should Do 33

Conclusion 37

Notes 39

List of Commissioned Papers 53

Members of the Commission

Daniel E. Griffiths
Chairman of the National Commission,
and New York University

Richard L. Andrews, Professor
University of Washington

Roland Barth, Co-director
The Principals' Center at Harvard

Bill Clinton, Governor
State of Arkansas

Alonzo Crim, Superintendent
Atlanta Public Schools

Lawrence L. Cunningham, Professor
The Ohio State University

William Dill, President
Babson College

Robin Farquhar, President
University of Winnipeg

Barbara L. Jackson, Professor
Morgan State University

Judith Lanier, Dean
Michigan State University

Martha M. McCarthy, Professor
Indiana University

Eleanor McMahon,
Commissioner of Higher Education
State of Rhode Island

Edna May Merson, President
National Association of
Elementary School Principals

Richard D. Miller, Executive Director
American Association of
School Administrators

Cecil Miskel, Dean
University of Utah

Robert O'Reilly, President
National Conference of Professors
of Educational Administration

Thomas Payzant, Superintendent
San Diego Public Schools

Nathan Quinones, Chancellor
New York City Board of Education

W. Ann Reynolds, Chancellor
California State University

Richard A. Rossmiller, Professor
University of Wisconsin-Madison

John C. Sawhill, Managing Director
McKinsey & Company

Albert Shanker, President
American Federation of Teachers

Thomas A. Shannon, Executive Director
National School Boards Association

Paula Silver, Professor
University of Illinois

Robert St. Clair, President
National Association of Secondary
School Principals

Max Weiner, Dean
Fordham University

Donald J. Willower, Professor
The Pennsylvania State University

Staff of the Commission

Robert T. Stout, Director of Studies, and
Arizona State University

Patrick B. Forsyth, Staff Coordinator and
The University Council for
Educational Administration

Joyce K. McGuinness
Special Assistant to the Commission, and
New York University

Terence A. Weninger
Special Assistant to the Commission, and
Arizona State University

Acknowledgements

If ever a national project was a cooperative enterprise the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration was it. From the moment of its conception, people and institutions have worked together to provide the resources of time, talent, and money to make the work of the Commission possible.

The need for a Commission was first realized by Professors Michael Murphy, University of Utah and Richard Rossmiller, University of Wisconsin, Madison. The idea was picked up enthusiastically by the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) Executive Committee and the member deans. The UCEA undertook to sponsor and support the Commission. Its director, Patrick Forsyth, has been a tower of strength.

Financial support for the Commission came from:

The Danforth Foundation

The Ford Foundation

The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation

University Council for Educational Administration

Association of Colleges and Schools of Education in State Universities and Land Grant Colleges and Affiliated Private Universities

New York University

Arizona State University

The three Commission meetings were subsidized by the Johnson and the Spring Hill Foundations.

The regional meetings were hosted by:

Arizona State University

University of Oregon

Georgia State University

University of Houston

Texas A & M

The Ohio State University

New York Alliance for the Public Schools

The expenses incurred by Commission members attending regional meetings were paid by their organizations or institutions.

A special vote of thanks is due to those who wrote papers to stimulate the thinking of the Commissioners. The paper writers, as everyone associated with the Commission, worked without honoraria.

Many individuals deserve special thanks for their work: Terence Weninger, Arizona State University, must rank high on anyone's list for his diligence and skill in handling the logistics of the Commission; Professor Robert Stout, Arizona State University, contributed greatly to the analysis of a vast amount of data and the general work of the Commission; Ann Lewis, for her work as writer and editor; Joyce McGuinness, New York University; for coordinating the Commission meetings; Professor James Bliss, Rutgers University, for the supply and demand study; Professors Norman Boyan and Laurence Iannaccone, University of California, Santa Barbara and Professor Charles Achilles, University of Tennessee for participation in a two day brainstorming session to kick-off the Commission's work; and to Professor Scott Norton, Arizona State University for his continuing advice and contributions.

The Commission profited from a close association with the National Governors Conference resulting in an exchange of information and mutual participation in meetings.

The Commission could not have functioned without the UCEA office staff: Rita Gnap, Kathleen Groth, Carmen Gomez, and Lynnette Harrell.

And finally, we must thank the almost 1300 people who participated in meetings, wrote papers, critiqued drafts of reports, and gave advice.

Daniel E. Griffiths
18 March 1987

Significant Recommendations

The central focus of this report is the improvement of educational leadership through these and other specific recommendations.

- Educational leadership should be redefined.
- A National Policy Board on Educational Administration should be established.
- Administrator preparation programs should be modeled after those in other professional schools.
- At least 300 universities and colleges should cease preparing educational administrators.
- Programs for recruitment and placement of ethnic minorities and women should be initiated by universities, school boards, state and federal governments, and the private sector.
- The public schools should become full partners in the preparation of school administrators.
- Professional development activities should be an integral component of the careers of professors of educational administration and practicing administrators.
- Licensure programs should be substantially reformed.

Preface*

For almost four years, the American public has been listening to various segments of society call for changes in the education system, from preschool to postgraduate study. The proposals began as major modifications of standards for students, then turned to developing a new capacity for accomplishment through restructuring the teaching profession. From these discussions, it became obvious that the needed agenda was not merely change, but a revolution in the way schools are organized, in the quality of those who teach, in the expectations for every child who enters the education system, and in the regard given education by all of society.

These things are necessary for survival, not of the education establishment, but of a way of life and governance buffeted by global economic competition and forces over which this country has little control. The ability of the United States to continue to strengthen its institutions and provide adequately for its people will depend upon the wise, vigorous investment made in them.

* Documentation for recommendations, general background, and relevant data are found in the **Notes** of this volume.

A revolution in education requires competent, skilled, visionary leadership as has never been available before. That is the issue addressed in this report by the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. This report adds to a spiral of reform-minded attention directed at students, teachers, college faculty, and school board members, turning the focus on those whose professional competence influences all others, the superintendents and principals who lead the schools. Although this report is focused on the roles of principals and superintendents, the recommendations apply to other school administrators as well. Revolutions occur because of, not in spite of, leadership.

The 27-member Commission, composed of leaders within and outside of the education profession, was asked by the University Council for Educational Administration to examine the quality of educational leadership in the country. The members of the Commission gathered periodically to review and direct the work of the staff. Information and advice were sought from over 1250 people primarily in six regional seminars. The day long seminars were attended by legislators, chief state school officers, school board members, as well as practicing school teachers, administrators, and professors. To broaden its scope, scholarly and creative papers were commissioned from a worldwide group of provocative thinkers. The staff, drawing upon these resources, produced the drafts of this report that eventually led to this vision of what schools must become, how schools will be led, and what policymakers should contribute to preparing and supporting school leadership.

The Commission also learned how much improvement is needed in educational administration. While important exceptions can be demonstrated, research reveals troubling aspects throughout the field, including:

- lack of a definition of good educational leadership,
- lack of leader recruitment programs in the schools,
- lack of collaboration between school districts and universities,
- the discouraging lack of minorities and women in the field,

- lack of systematic professional development for school administrators,
- lack of quality candidates for preparation programs,
- lack of preparation programs relevant to the job demands of school administrators,
- lack of sequence, modern content, and clinical experiences, in preparation programs,
- lack of licensure systems which promote excellence,
- lack of a national sense of cooperation in preparing school leaders.

The sum of the proposals contained in this report will alter dramatically the shape of schools, the relationships among leaders and administrators, the preparation of educational administrators, and, subsequently, their work. This report aspires to nothing less than the restructuring of a national understanding of requirements for educational leadership of the future.

Some will view these proposals as radical. Others will see them as part of a continuum of change already occurring. However seen, they are intended as calls for action.

The Commission appeals for an understanding of the seriousness of the changes being asked of schools and their leaders. Policy makers and influentials throughout the country are asked for resolve and great urgency in the task of reform.

What follows is a set of recommendations addressed to major players in the reform of education. A larger volume containing background papers and papers commissioned specifically for this report, will be published shortly.

1. A Vision of School Leadership

It is 7:15 a.m. when Lee Jones pulls into the school parking lot, but there are many cars there already. The Early Bird activity bus has just unloaded a group of youngsters who head for different parts of the building.

Jones catches up with those bound for Jefferson School's Technology Center, which houses the computers equipped with modems. The students have come early to send queries to a history class in Paris, France. They want help on their research project about the underground resistance in France during World War II. The principal chats with the students as they walk down the hallway and asks to read their project report when it is finished. The French teacher might be able to use it. Leaving coat and briefcase at the office, Jones begins the early rounds of the school. In the Adult Center, a primary grade team is consulting with a parent about her son's diagnostic test scores in reading. Before the conference is over, the team and parent will have worked out the child's study plan for school and home and determined how they will communicate about it over the next few weeks. Making coffee in the kitchen area at the Adult Center are a master teacher

and student teacher getting ready for a breakfast meeting with a chemist from a nearby laboratory. The chemist, following Jones' speech at a meeting of the local Chemical Society about the goals of Jefferson's science curriculum, has offered to teach a unit on scientific methods to older students.

In the pre-school wing Jones checks with the director of the community-run day care program about the helper project. The student council has enlisted students to help an hour a day with activities for the little children. The principal and director talk about how to evaluate the experience for young and older students.

Before school begins, Jones has looked in on a retired public accountant tutoring a young Early Bird having trouble with math, and has chatted with a group of adults finishing up a project from their communications class before they head off for work. The class has developed a videotape of the oldest members of their families discussing school in the old days. The tape, to be shown on the school's cable TV system, is their final exam. Jones also has greeted the students as they arrived and confirmed the day's activities.

Jones' morning obligations include:

Reading a report on the evaluation of a program for slower learners at the school and making a list of possible improvements in the program,

Reviewing the objectives of a new literature/writing unit developed by the school language arts team and some faculty of the nearby university,

Attending the first large group lecture of the team and making notes to discuss later with the master teacher,

Scheduling a budget expert to talk with the parents' council and the teachers of the school before they begin planning next year's school budget.

Just before lunch Jones meets with a master teacher and two student teachers who have developed a unit on civic responsibility, the history project which brought the students in

early to use the telecommunications system. They discuss resources they might request from their university team.

Based on student complaints that the program for individualized learning in history contains redundant software units, Jones speaks with a master teacher about forming a teacher-student committee to review the integration of video cassettes and computer programmed instruction. They agree that the committee should examine history's software library for overlap and scope and report necessary changes to the history faculty.

After lunch the principal meets with the ten master teachers (one from each learning area) about how they plan to give their annual assessment report to the school community. They discuss what graphics to ask the central office to develop, how to describe new instructional goals, and when to schedule reports from students on their projects.

It is early afternoon, and Jefferson's administrative intern from State University presents her recommendations for disciplinary action on two students. Jones and the intern also review together a master teacher's evaluation of a student teacher whom they will observe the next day.

Jones places a few phone calls—to parents of the students who are to work off their discipline with a service project at school, to the school council president about plans for the upcoming report card day for the school. Then Jones begins another stint of management–by–walking–around as the students board buses, a meeting with a teacher to find out how the new literature lecture is tying into writing projects, and a meeting with the union representative in the building to discuss the awards luncheon for two teachers who have just received national board certification.

But before leaving the building Jones jots down items from today which will prompt action tomorrow. The teacher who has taken the lead on the new reading program, can be assisted by a willing parent; another teacher should be congratulated on his approach to a child having problems; the professional development center needs to be asked for a com-

puter search on evaluating peer teaching for the day care director, and a requisition needs to be prepared ordering another phone for the teachers' lounge.

Jones' last act is to prepare notes for a case study on the program for slower learners. Jones is to present the case to other principals at their weekly conference.

The lights will stay on long after Jones leaves. The day care center is open for several more hours; the Technology Center is waiting for a class of parents and students, and the after-school program, run jointly by the school, recreation, and health departments, has been planned to meet the needs of students and community members through its classes and activities.

Preparing leaders for the schools American society needs is a challenge. While no composite profile can cover all the priorities or describe every nuance of school administration, a day with the principal of Jefferson illustrates the direction of changes already taking place. Schools must:

- **Demonstrate that they are learning communities.** Standards are high and understood by both students and staff. Resources are available to all in the community who need them. The school serves as a partner with the universities in preparing teachers and administrators, and the school staff is caught up in constant professional self-renewal.
- **Foster collegiality.** Teachers and administrators share in planning, implementation, evaluation, and in learning together. The administrator becomes a leader, facilitator, matching needs with resources, aware of when to intervene and when not to, and constantly preparing for the specific needs of the students and staff.
- **Individualize instruction.** Individualization requires appropriate assessment and proper instructional grouping based on sound educational reasons rather than architectural or bureaucratic ones. It also requires the use of resources outside of the school to help children with problems that impede learning, sufficient and varied class-

room resources, and an investment in teachers that ensures that individualized instruction succeeds.

- **Encourage involvement.** A good school will belong to many constituencies because they will have roles in setting its standards, reviewing its progress, and shaping its programs. Educational professionals will respect parents as a child's first and most important teachers and support them as essential partners in the learning process. Neighbors, business leaders, retired people, and others will be drawn into the learning community. A school administrator must not only create this climate of involvement, but also be an advocate for children within the community, acquiring the resources to meet needs.

Recently, the public schools' capacity to educate children and young people with diverse needs has been severely questioned. But, even if improvements brought education performance up to traditional standards, that would not be sufficient. American society needs an unprecedented level of intellectual leadership. To provide the quality of learning that is demanded, educational leadership must show great resourcefulness and creativity in devising new structures that make full use of teaching talent. There won't be enough excellent teachers; those currently working must be used wisely.

The evolution of reforms over the past few years has progressed from cosmetic changes in course requirements to radical restructuring of the school environment. The new roles envisioned for teachers in reports of both the Holmes Group and the Carnegie Forum Task Force on Teaching as a Profession draw education into a broader field of management research from which it has been isolated for too long. At the same time, these reports identify the unique setting of the school workplace, envisioning how teachers could respond to greater autonomy and professionalism. Yet, the reforms cannot be successful without strong, well-reasoned leadership from principals and superintendents.

The Commission endorses this view of school-based change, fully aware of the awesome and exciting differences this would mean in the responsibilities of school administrators and in the skills they would need. The school community, for example, should have the

authority to develop programs; control budgets; hire, promote, and retain staff; and select materials. One result of these changes, of course, would be smaller central office staffs.

And the superintendency, while retaining much of its statutory functions, would also change.

As Kelly Jackson dresses for the day, the telecommunications system is displaying the morning news. Noting that a report on science education will be released in Washington later in the day, Jackson begins to formulate comments. As superintendent of education, Jackson's comments are certain to be wanted by reporters.

The first stop of the morning is at City Hall to drop off written comments about a proposed new-parent program at the community hospital. Because of concern that the plan provides for no follow-up, Jackson wants it to include a referral service to school programs for parents. The city human services director agrees, and they develop a joint statement for the upcoming city council meeting.

By mid-morning, Jackson has talked with a newspaper reporter and agreed to a television interview about the status of science education in the district's schools. The interview will be based on a report of science achievement scores and the report of a community task force on integrating laboratory techniques into primary grades. Jackson then chairs a small meeting of principals working with the State University team on management skills.

Before leaving to speak to the Business-School Partnership League about the district's long-term plan for achieving excellence, Jackson checks with the district business manager on items for an upcoming school board meeting and makes a note that the facilities planning report has omitted a mandatory public hearing.

The afternoon begins with a call to the school board chairperson on the positive reaction to the luncheon speech. Jackson next mediates a disagreement over supplemental reading materials used in one of the schools. Jackson has read the report from the school faculty, the central office staff analysis

and a report from the School Librarians' Association that critiqued the materials. The meeting produces a decision; the materials are too advanced and are better used at the next grade level.

Jackson then reviews the applications of finalists for the principal's position of a new high school. The application files contain reports from the assessment center, educational records, observations, written assignments given the applicants, interviews, and reports from a peer review committee. Jackson's administrative intern also has checked the research on qualities desirable in a principal assigned to a newly opened school. The recommendation to the board of education will be well documented.

The superintendent takes a few moments for exercise in the staff fitness room before going to teach an advanced course on curriculum and instruction at State University.

A day in the life of Kelly Jackson does not demonstrate the whole story of the emerging role of the superintendent of education, but it does lead to several generalizations. Superintendents of education must lead in many ways.

- They must symbolize education in the community. Through their public statements they must express, project, and embody the purpose and character of public education.
- They must be able academicians having the ability to recognize excellence in teaching, learning, and research. They must know where and when to intervene to strengthen academic structures, choose able principals and support their search for talented teachers. They must know how to gather data and also how to analyze and use it.
- They must exercise the wisest kind of political behavior by resolving the conflicting demands of many constituents and, in turn, gain their support for education.
- They must be highly competent managers who demonstrate their skill in selecting staff, planning for the future, building the budget, and constructing and maintaining the school plant.

Beyond these broad categories of leadership, superintendents act as executive officers of boards of education, deal with the media, administer the union contract (which superintendents have had a responsibility to negotiate), collaborate with all other youth-serving organizations in the community, work well with experts, and they are skilled group leaders, speakers, and writers. They must provide the vision that inspires all those touched by the community of learning to do their best.

Today's few superintendents and principals who attain the skill and leadership outlined in the scenarios above do so against considerable odds. The preparation is not available and the concepts of how schools must be organized and led are not widely held.

The Commission's recommendations will enable quality leadership to flourish.

2. What Public Schools Should Do

The Commission's vision for the public schools requires changes in the way schools actually operate so that teachers will play significant roles in helping to formulate and implement educational policies affecting the instructional program, teachers will have more discretion over classroom decisions, and individual schools will have more control over curricular, personnel, and budget matters within district-wide policy. School districts are urged to broaden the scope of their educational activities, participate in recruitment and preparation of administrators, invest financially in administrator professional development, and employ women and ethnic minorities as principals and superintendents.

School boards, superintendents, and principals should develop a specific plan to implement these recommendations. Each has a unique and important role to play, school boards in governance and the generation of public and financial support for change, and superintendents, principals, and other administrators in providing instructional leadership. Working together, they can bring these recommendations into fruition. The public schools and students they serve will be the beneficiaries.

2.1 The public schools should share responsibility with universities and professional organizations for the preparation of administrators.

While the universities should take major responsibility for preparing educational administrators, public schools and professional organizations offer opportunities and unique perspectives for preparation. Both should be used in joint programs with universities, to supervise clinical experiences, to provide faculty for campus classrooms, and to participate in field research. Just as superintendents and principals can be used professionally on campuses, professors of educational administration could be used in schools. They might substitute for a regular principal on leave or serve as long-term consultants to the central administration. Professors of educational administration need to keep their own administrative skills up–to–date and stay attuned to administrative practice.

2.2 School districts should design, operate, and monitor programs of administrator professional development.

While the state should subsidize the professional development of administrators (and teachers), local school districts should develop and monitor such programs. In a later recommendation the Commission calls for individual programs designed to meet the needs of each administrator, perhaps as annual growth plans.

2.3 The public schools should have programs to recruit quality administrators from among their teachers.

There is a large pool of educators with administrator certificates, but schools in the future will need quality leadership that can respond positively to more sophisticated preparation and job responsibilities. Regrettably, the record is discouraging. Of the 94 career choices of those taking the Graduate Record Examination, school administrators rank fourth from the bottom on GRE scores. Only home economics, physical education, and social work candidates score lower. As the teaching force declines in numbers as well as quality, and more highly motivated teachers opt for career ladder advancements rather than administrative posts, school districts will

need to make vigorous efforts to recruit qualified candidates for administration. Assessment centers may be useful in identifying and developing skills of potential school leaders and practicing administrators.

2.4 School districts should have policies that specifically identify promising candidates for principalships and superintendencies among women and ethnic minorities.

In spite of research demonstrating that women make good administrators, the percentage of women principals has declined and the number of women superintendents has increased only from 1.7 percent to 3 percent since 1970. These conditions prevail despite federal and foundation-supported attempts to encourage women into administration. Yet, the pool of potential administrators among women is growing. Currently, about one-half of the graduate students in educational administration are women.

Blacks and Hispanics are underrepresented dramatically in administrative posts, reflecting the declining percentage of blacks entering higher education and the continued low incidence of Hispanic enrollments. Because of the high cost of a college education today and a shrinking student aid program, fewer minorities are choosing education, preferring careers with higher entering salaries.

Through vigorous policies that give recruitment of women and minorities into administrative posts a high priority, superintendents and school boards can affect the entire school system, including students considering career choices.

2.5 Practicing administrators have an obligation to analyze their work and contribute actively to the development of its clinical knowledge base.

Practitioners must contribute to the knowledge base in educational administration, capitalizing on the insights they gain from administration. Practitioners are particularly useful in determining new areas for research or areas where research efforts need to be supplemented.

2.6 School districts should invite leadership from all parts of the community.

All superintendents and principals should, as many now do, reach out to the community and enlist those with leadership ability to aid the schools. A dimension of the superintendent's role is to advocate and sell education, always mobilizing community support.

2.7 Secondary schools should encourage talented students to become teachers and educational leaders.

If the nation's schools are to have the excellent teachers and administrators they will need in the future, they must be willing to compete for the most competent students from a shrinking cohort of young people. Counselors should have current information about the profession; award and scholarship programs should be used to stimulate interest in education.

3. What Professional Organizations Should Do

The major professional organizations for school administrators have barely begun to tap their potential to improve the profession. Their members: superintendents, central office personnel, and principals, represent the best constituency to analyze the changes that are needed in the preparation of administrators and to seek those changes actively. The organizations could have an especially important role in several areas.

3.1 The profession should recruit intellectually superior and capable individuals to administrator preparation programs.

Given the number of individuals holding teaching positions, the pool of potential school administrators is quite large. There has been, however, no systematic attempt to recruit the ablest from this pool. The process has been largely that of self-selection. Professional organizations should identify outstanding candidates for school administration and encourage them, through scholarship programs, to undertake preparation. The organizations also could have as a specific goal the identification of women and minorities who should be enlisted into administrator preparation.

3.2 The profession should become involved substantively in the preparation of educational administrators, especially in the planning, implementing, and assessment of programs.

University programs need the expertise of practicing school administrators to develop the best and most relevant learning experiences. Representatives from professional organizations should be included on university committees that design, deliver, and evaluate administrator preparation programs, on both a short-term and long-term basis.

Likewise, the professional associations should select highly qualified members to serve on such committees and provide them with the necessary support to make their contributions as useful as possible.

3.3 A National Policy Board on Educational Administration should be established.

The Board would include representatives from those national organizations with interests in educational administration. The Board would have several functions including the following: monitor the implementation of the Commission's recommendations, conduct periodic national reviews of preparation for educational administrators and professors, encourage the development of high quality programs for preparation of educational administrators, produce white papers on critical national policy issues in education, hold forums for discussions of issues in educational administration, and generally ensure good communication across interest groups about policy concerns.

An early agenda item would be the consideration of the establishment of a national academy or board of professional school administration. Currently there is no forum to recognize those school administrators whose performance and contributions to the profession exceed all standards. The national academy would fill this void and accept for membership, candidates who have provided evidence of sustained exemplary performance, who have shared their ideas through presentations and publications, and, who have succeeded in rigorous examination. The academy is similar in purpose to the Carnegie Task Force's suggestion for a National Board for Professional

Teaching Standards. Certification by the academy would be voluntary. The academy would have direct and beneficial effects on state licensure standards and administrator preparation programs.

4. What Universities Should Do

When Lee Jones was recruited as a potential administrator, the school district also provided support for further study. Given a sabbatical with partial continuing salary, Jones entered the program at State University in a cadre of 30 full-time students. The school district was willing to make such an investment in Jones because of demonstrated leadership as a teacher, good communication skills, and an excellent academic background.

With an undergraduate degree in arts and sciences and a master's degree in teaching, Jones was ready to begin preparation for school leadership. Jones' cohort started with early required coursework focused on the study of administration, advanced curriculum design and management, and administrative skills development. Coursework for the cohort took place throughout the campus: in public administration, in business, in arts and sciences, and in education. Because of a particular interest in multi-cultural education, Jones elected some anthropology courses. All members of the cohort completed the required administrative core subjects such as law, finance, personnel, facilities planning, and politics of education. In order to develop a perspective, the cohort studied the development of educational administration as a profession and the

functioning of American educational systems and those of other countries.

In addition to coursework, the cohort in school administration was immediately introduced to the skills center and a planned sequence of short-term field experiences carefully supervised by the administration faculty and a group of exceptional practitioners serving the university as clinical professors. Guided and independent practice in the skills center helped students become convincing public speakers and developed other skills important to public service administrators.

The next sequence in Jones' studies involved the application of administrative studies and research findings to school problems. The cohort first focused on research findings and clinical study within the university setting using such techniques as meta-analysis and simulation. Later, groups of students working with clinical and research professors engaged in problem-solving activities in actual school environments.

The next strand of Jones' preparation was supervised practice, consisting of short- and long-term internships under the direction of research faculty and practitioners who were clinical faculty members at State University.

Singling out a specific type of school setting to specialize in, one with a multi-cultural student body, Jones entered the final phase of graduate preparation, demonstrating competence. Under the supervision of clinical professors, Jones served as a principal intern, sharing experiences and observations with fellow students and the professors. Evaluation of Jones' progress was based on the practical application of knowledge and skills, a group field study project, in addition to traditional measures of competence and demonstrated abilities at the university's administrative skills center.

Currently, university preparation for educational administration is the same as for researchers and professors. It consists of a traditional university degree program of coursework, periodic examinations, and a thesis. As in other service professions, however, school administrators need more than mastery of a body of knowledge.

Their performance depends on the ability to determine the needs of those they serve and to meet those needs with practical skills rooted in an appropriate knowledge base. We are urged by the unique responsibilities of school administrators to suggest that their university preparation should differ from that of researchers because it must emphasize the application of knowledge and skills in clinical rather than academic situations.

Complex demands on educational leadership require that preparation programs be designed around five strands:

- the study of administration,
- the study of the technical core of educational administration and the acquisition of vital administrative skills,
- the application of research findings and methods to problems,
- supervised practice,
- demonstration of competence.

Preparation for professional practice rests on some assumptions that have not been characteristic of school administrator preparation. It is assumed that, because of its importance, preparation is preservice; that is, no one is allowed to practice before he or she is prepared. Logically, preparation is a sequenced and mentored path from theory to practice. It is also assumed that students will progress through the preparation program as a cohort. The nature of professional work, complicated analyses and problem solving, requires the formation of values of colleagueship in which the student becomes accustomed to seeking and giving advice and working closely with other professionals. Students in a cohort learn the importance of colleagueship and other professional values. A further assumption is that preparation is accomplished in blocks of full-time study. Preparation to serve in occupations key to our society's health should not be taken lightly. People who choose to serve in critical occupations make personal sacrifices to insure their preparation and competence and to demonstrate their commitment to serving society as trusted professionals. Although full-time preparation

is generally superior, some universities have developed alternatives that may accomplish many of the goals of full-time preparation. Lastly, it is assumed that professional preparation is a joint responsibility of the university and the profession. Universities respond to the changing nature of professional work; practitioners take active roles in the mentoring and induction of new practitioners. To insure the relevance of preparation, the development of new knowledge, and the improvement of professional practice, the university and the profession work closely to plan, design, and deliver professional preparation.

The Commission's recommendations for universities are directed at different levels.

To Professors

4.1 Administrator preparation programs should be like those in professional schools which emphasize theoretical and clinical knowledge, applied research, and supervised practice.

The Commission argues that the logic of professional preparation, which introduces students to theory and research and then gradually guides them into the world of practice, is well-suited for the important work of school administration. The necessarily close working relationship between the university and the world of practice will benefit the quality of research and the quality of administrator preparation. In addition, public interests are served by the fact that administrators have studied school administration in the university and have been mentored by a team of research and clinical professors prior to independent practice.

4.2 The position of educational administration program chairperson should be one of leadership with responsibility for program development and renewal.

Too often, program leadership is regarded as temporary and a duty rather than as a challenge. This should change immediately. The creation of a dynamic, effective setting for the study of schools

and the preparation of school administrators is not a chance happening. Scholars who reluctantly serve as chairpersons are unlikely to create an exciting setting. Election by peers does not guarantee strong leadership. Program chairpersons should be committed to constantly improving programs, to linking administrator preparation to the best resources on the campus and in the field, and to supporting only high-quality research.

4.3 Professors should collaborate with administrators on reforming curricula for administrator preparation.

Administrator preparation programs must undertake the major reforms indicated in this report, and that impetus will have to come from the current faculty. Faculty efforts, however, must be in concert with the best of professional practice if they are to have the relevance and currency that are necessary.

4.4 The faculty of administrator preparation programs should have varied academic backgrounds and experience.

The program faculty should reflect balanced diversity. In addition to traditional specialties such as organizational studies and school finance, a department should have clinical professors, some of whom are professional, practicing administrators. Also, a department will need faculty who can recruit students, evaluate them, develop mentoring programs, and supervise internships.

4.5 Professional development should be included in the performance reviews of professors.

Changes in preparation programs, a maturing research capacity, and requirements for knowledge relevant to administrative practice, make professional development of professors of educational administration particularly crucial. The development plan should be formalized so that its importance is evident and so that planning can be done to fund aspects of the plan calling for external resources.

To Deans

4.6 Universities should fund and staff administrator preparation programs at a level that makes excellence possible.

In many universities, the resources of administrator preparation programs have been reduced to a point where an adequate program is not possible. Almost 40 percent of the departments report a reduction in the number of faculty lines in educational administration during the past 10 years, with two faculty members lost for every member added. Many programs no longer employ graduate and research assistants; few have adequate support staff and equipment.

If the programs shift to a clinical approach for the training of administrators, as strongly recommended by the Commission, they will need more resources. It is ludicrous for universities to expect improvement and development of relevant, rigorous clinical preparation without adequate funding.

4.7 The reward structure for professors should be changed to recognize curriculum reform, instructional innovation, and other activities in addition to traditional scholarship.

The excellent programs of preparation envisioned by the Commission rely on more than traditional scholarship. Professors must be actively involved in working for school improvements, designing and evaluating school-based research, and recruiting and monitoring highly qualified candidates for school administration.

The Commission acknowledges that consulting with school districts is a legitimate activity of professors. However, this should be considered a part of the assignments of the professors, subject to peer review and university coordination and regulation, with compensation plans developed that are fair to all parties.

4.8 Universities should provide scholarships and other incentives to recruit able students and particularly those from ethnic minority groups.

Working with school districts and professional organizations, universities need to identify and recruit highly capable individuals to enter teaching and school administration. Recruitment should begin with information and incentives to high school students.

The desired recruits should demonstrate high intellectual capacity, leadership potential, and the communication skills so necessary for education careers. Universities should use screening and selection procedures that complement other kinds of assessments to identify talented students. They should arrange for subsidized internships, scholarships, and work experience through public and private sponsors to support those recruited for the profession.

To Presidents and Academic Vice-Presidents

4.9 Universities unable to accept the spirit of excellence described in this report should cease preparing administrators.

There are 505 institutions offering courses in school administration in the United States, but less than 200 have the resources and commitment to provide the excellence called for by the Commission.

The years ahead will be dominated by changes in school demographics, teaching technologies, and the roles of educators. These will require school leaders comfortable with creativity, experimentation, and rigorous standards for their programs. Such persons cannot be prepared by mediocre programs in academically weak institutions.

The preparation programs must have intellectual vigor, high standards of practice, and a challenging faculty who are themselves active scholars, valued consultants, and exciting mentors. Departments of educational administration must be vibrant intellectual communities. Unfortunately, surveys indicate that a large percent-

age of current faculty members consider their programs to be of high quality and see no need for major changes.

Universities must require periodic review by outside experts to evaluate the effectiveness of administrator preparation programs.

The Commission believes a quality program requires a minimum of five full-time faculty members (the median number of educational administration faculty in all administrator preparation programs is 3.9), first-rate instructional materials, sophisticated technologies, and a cohort of highly qualified full-time students.

Because it is concerned about the great number of individuals being prepared and licensed in programs with inadequate resources and little commitment to quality, the Commission recommends that the campuses prepare fewer—better. Like other professional programs, an excellent one in educational administration will have fewer students and require greater university support. Only institutions willing to support such excellence should continue to prepare school leaders.

University leadership needs to join with that of state governors, as expressed in their report, *Time for Results*, "to focus resources and energies on a limited number of excellent administrator preparation programs."

5. What State Policymakers Should Do

Although the schooling of future generations is, in the lofty rhetoric of public discourse, touted as the nation's most critical responsibility, it is difficult to think of another profession in which screening is so poorly executed. Current licensure procedures do a great disservice because they appear to designate individuals particularly suited by character, intelligence, and skill to administer schools. That claim is indefensible. This is the major issue which state policy makers need to address, but not the only one.

5.1 Each state should have an administrative licensure board to establish standards, examine candidates, issue licenses, and have the authority to revoke licenses.

The Commission agrees with the Holmes Group and The Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy that educators must be given more authority and responsibility for teaching and learning. Part of that empowerment requires that administrators take collective responsibility for setting and enforcing standards of admission to the profession as well as for continuing practice. Where they do not already exist, the Commission recommends that each state establish a school administrator licensure board composed of ad-

ministrators, professors of educational administration, and school board members. The authority of the board would include establishment of standards for licensure, the thorough examination of candidates, the adoption and enforcement of a code of ethics, and granting and revocation of licenses, based on established procedures.

5.2 Licensure should depend on the completion of a state-approved program, demonstration of knowledge and skills, evidence of performance, recommendation by the professional preparation program, adherence to a professional code of ethics and, in the case of principals, teaching experience.

The licensure procedure must ensure quality in school leadership. The Commission recommends that those permitted to apply for licensure be limited to persons who have completed a state approved program, passed rigorous written and oral examinations, and have shown competence in simulated or actual work settings.

Although teaching experience should be a prerequisite for the position of principal, it may not be necessary for superintendents in very large cities. In that case, the teaching requirement might be waived in the face of skills gained from experience in other appropriate settings. All other superintendents should have had teaching experience.

The standards should be written in terms of skills, knowledge, and attitudes considered desirable for educational administrators, not in numbers of courses. Merely accumulating course credits should not be a "back door" entrance to school administration.

The assessments should ascertain that a candidate has good communications skills, as well as those of pedagogy, management, and leadership. As a long-term goal, state boards of licensure could cooperate on the development of a common testing program for all states, although authority over licensure should reside with each state licensure board.

5.3 Licenses for educational administrators should have two tiers: entry level and fully licensed status.

The entry-level license would be granted after completion of a state-approved program but prior to professional practice. A school administrator would become fully licensed only after documenting successful performance in a full-time administrative position for at least three years.

5.4 Temporary or emergency licensure should not be granted.

Studies by the Commission and others indicate there are two-to-three times as many people currently holding school administrator licenses as there are positions. Rather than increase the pool, the objective of state policymakers should be to limit it to only the fully qualified.

5.5 A license should be issued for a specified time period. Renewal of the license should depend on successful performance and continuing professional development.

Professional knowledge and skills become dated. This is especially true in education now that sophisticated research techniques are making a major contribution to the field. A few states have attempted to keep education leaders up to date, but the Commission generally is unimpressed with the quality and scope of these programs. Moreover, these programs often are disassociated from professional control and preservice preparation; they lack sequence and continuity.

The Commission recommends that school administration licenses require renewal, to be granted on the basis of successful performance and continuing professional development under the quality control of the state licensure board.

5.6 Licenses should be portable from state to state.

The Commission makes this recommendation because school boards must have the freedom to recruit exceptional administrators from all regions of the United States.

5.7 School administrators should be able to transfer retirement benefits from state-to-state.

Currently, retirement benefits are not portable, placing another limitation on the school administrator candidates which school districts have available to them. The Commission recognizes the difficulties in developing and administering plans to allow benefits to be portable, but points out this could be a worthwhile undertaking of professional organizations working with states.

5.8 States should supplement the cost of financing professional development programs for educational administrators.

High quality programs of professional development for school administrators will be costly, but they are a needed investment. Just as most states have line-item appropriations for teacher staff development, all states should set aside funding for the continuing education of school administrators. State leadership could enlist the support and involvement of the private sector in helping school administrators keep abreast of the latest knowledge and practices in management and service delivery. Further, the state board of professional school administrator licensure should be responsible for monitoring and quality control of professional development.

5.9 Each state should develop policies for the recruitment and placement of minorities and women in administrative positions.

State and federal programs of equal opportunity and affirmative action are not working in educational administration. For example, only 3 percent of the superintendents in the country are female, and the number of female principals has declined in recent years. Yet, half of the graduate students in educational administration are female. State policies should vigorously encourage the hiring of qualified females for administrative positions.

The ethnic minority problem is different. There are too few ethnic minority students in higher education, a problem that begins with early education programs that are inadequate for the needs of minorities. States need to address these larger societal problems, then follow-up with career counseling, scholarship aid for needy stu-

dents, and affirmative action policies that ensure the encouragement of larger numbers of ethnic minorities to choose educational administration as a career.

6. What Federal Policymakers Should Do

The Commission believes that the federal government should undertake or expand upon efforts which will produce more capable leadership for the nation's schools. This is a matter of national concern; one which requires national attention and federal support.

6.1 The federal government should continue to provide significant funding for research in educational administration.

Educational administration needs an expanding knowledge base developed by competent researchers and incorporating contributions from leadership in other countries and from other professions. The federal government should increase its investment in research applicable to school administration. Further, it should be the catalyst for encouraging public schools, professional organizations, and universities to pool their efforts to improve the profession. The federal government should fund research that helps educational administration draw from the best practices and knowledge of management in the private sector and in relevant professions. Above all, emphasis should be given to support research on the unique role of the education administrator.

6.2 The federal government should fund a graduate fellowship program in educational administration for ethnic minorities.

Federal programs can be both substantive and symbolic. Not only would such a fellowship program benefit individuals and school administration in general, but it would stimulate state and local efforts to make ethnic minority participation in educational administration a priority.

7. What The Private Sector Should Do

Concurrent with the education reform proposals of the past few years has been a resurgence of interest by the private sector, especially foundations and business/industry, in public education. Indeed, many forward-looking reform recommendations have come from panels that included representatives of major corporations in this country. The interest is recognizably self-serving; only a much better educated population will have the skills necessary for this country to compete globally.

One by–product of this renewed involvement has been the realization of how much the private sector can help education. This is less a matter of material contribution, more one of expertise and political leverage. The field of school administration would benefit greatly from continued and increased involvement with the private sector. Likewise, schools have knowledge about new populations and effective practices that the private sector would find useful.

7.1 Business, industry and the public schools should exchange specialized personnel to provide each other with relevant, useful information.

Education personnel have experience in working with a great diversity of populations, those who are entering or will enter the workforce. And business/industry has developed sophisticated and elaborate training programs for its personnel which incorporate contemporary technology. The two sectors should exchange appropriate information and personnel.

7.2 Foundations should support research and development programs focused on the clinical phases of preparation.

Research that addresses the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values to be gained through clinical experience needs funding sources that allow it to be creative and sustained. This is one of the great contributions which foundations make to the education field and which generally is unavailable from public sources.

7.3 Businesses and industries should provide technical assistance to education agencies in the development of optimum uses of technology.

The rate of technological change is so rapid that public sector institutions have difficulty keeping pace. They do not have the expertise nor the funding needed. The private sector, on the other hand, can make this kind of investment, and in many instances, is creating the technology which education should be using. Partnerships focused on this issue alone would contribute greatly, not only to the knowledge base in school administration, but to the effective application of technology by school administrators.

7.4 Foundations, businesses, and industries should provide fellowships for ethnic minorities to pursue preparation for school administration.

The Commission believes that the private sector must accept the challenge to increase the number of minorities in educational administration. As noted before, minority representation in higher education is dismally low. The Commission would not want the improvement of school administration through full-time programs of study to discourage even more ethnic minorities from entering the profession.

The private sector must join the public sector in enabling ethnic minorities to participate as fully as others in a renewed, substantively improved field of educational administration.

7.5 Business, industry and education leaders should participate jointly in management training programs.

The demand for greater autonomy in schools springs not from the education sector, but from evolving management practices. Educational administration would not be playing "catch up" if it had been learning, along with the business sector, about successful, new organizational practices. Further, joint training arrangements would provide the business sector with more information about school-related issues and possibly stimulate greater collaboration between public school administration and private resources.

Conclusion

This report has presumed much by the wide sweep of its recommendations. Although the focus of the report has been to assert ways in which the preparation of school administrators must be improved, of necessity, related themes have been addressed. Preparation of educational administrators cannot be isolated from their identification, recruitment, licensure, employment, and continued professionalization. Nor can it be separated from either the major changes in responsibility of future leaders or the new structures of the schools they will lead. All the parts are linked. The absence of change in one will inhibit change in the others. But a beginning must be made.

Although the proposals call for high levels of expenditure of will and resolve, they are not expensive in monetary terms. The cost of these reforms is insignificant as a percentage of what is spent in this country on all phases of public schooling. As an investment the reforms will have tremendous returns.

The proposals have been addressed to policy makers and influentials in a number of segments of the education scene. They have the capacity to do what is asked. They can be persuaded that doing so is right. Unless all of them accept the challenges presented here, the reforms advocated in the major reports, already sparking public debate and commitments, may become a revolution that dies

for lack of leadership, taking with it the confidence of the American public and the will of the American society to support an education system that can assure it of a viable future.

Notes

Preface

The national reports of particular interest to the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration are:

A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. (1986). New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group. (1986). East Lansing: The Holmes Group, Inc.

Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education. (1986). Washington: National Governors' Association Center for Policy Research and Analysis.

School Boards. (1986). Washington: The Institute for Educational Leadership.

The problems which the Commission are addressing are drawn from:

Achilles, C. (1984). Forecast: Stormy weather ahead in educational administration. *Issues in Education,* 2, 127-135.

Barth, R. (1987). On sheep and goats. *Leaders for America's Schools.* San Francisco: McCutchan, forthcoming.

Foster, W. (1987). Educational administration: A critical appraisal. *Leaders for America's Schools.* San Francisco: McCutchan, forthcoming.

Greenfield, T.B. (1987). Representing organization theory with a human face: The search for a human and humane understanding of administration. *Leaders for America's Schools.* San Francisco: McCutchan, forthcoming.

Griffiths, D.E. (1979). Intellectual turmoil in educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 25(3), 43-65.*

Peterson, K.D., & Finn, C.E., Jr. (1985). Principals, superintendents, and the administrator's art. *The Public Interest, 79, 42-62.*

Shakeshaft, C. (1987). Women in educational administration: implications for training. *Leaders for America's Schools.* San Francisco: McCutchan, forthcoming.

Cornett, L. (1985). Rethinking the selection and preparation of school principals. Paper presented to the National Governor's Association Task Force and School Leadership and Management, Little Rock.

Perhaps the most complete and scholarly critique of preparation programs is:

Pitner, N. (1982, February). Training of the school administrator: State of the art. CEPM. Eugene: University of Oregon, 59.

1. A Vision of Educational Leadership

The following is a list of the background documents and information that figured into the thinking of the Commission. The societal changes below are drawn from:

Kanter, R.M. (1983). *The Change Masters.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Education Vital Signs. (1985). Compiled by the editors of *The American School Board Journal* and *The Executive Educator.*

Griffiths, D.E. (1975). The collapse of consensus. *New York University Education Quarterly, 7(1), 1-7.*

Graubard, S.R. (1980). The end of consensus? [Summer issue]. *Daedalus, The Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.*

There is an array of social, political, technological, and demographic changes that make it more difficult than ever before for educational leaders to achieve their goal of quality education for all. Discussions at the regional seminars concentrated on the following changes:

- Widespread use of birth control has decreased the number of children and changed the proportions of age groups in society, leading to a decline in public support for education.
- The women's movement has sharply reduced education's best source of able teachers, with women being placed in positions of leadership in government, business, and the professions.
- Political parties have been weakened through splintering and the multiplication of special interest groups, making it difficult, if not impossible, to govern.
- More than half of all wives are employed outside the home.
- Over half of all families have two wage earners.
- The median amount of schooling for all wage earners has moved past one year of college.
- Almost two-thirds of all households have no children.
- Approximately 20 percent of all families are headed by women with no husband present. The annual income for these families is less than one-half that of families headed by married couples.
- Ethnic minorities constitute the majority of school enrollments in 23 of the 25 largest cities.
- The demand for new teachers exceeds the supply.

An excellent discussion of the role of the principal and an incisive analysis of the concept of the instructional leader is to be found in:

Greenfield, W.D. (1986). Moral, social, and technical dimensions of the principalship. [Summer issue]. *Peabody Journal of Education.*

The discussion of changes in the division of authority in schools and society draws on:

Chapman, J. (1987). A new conception of the principalship: descentralization, devolution, and the administration of Australian schools. NCEEA, *Leaders for America's Schools.* San Francisco: McCutchan, forthcoming.

Murphy, M.J. Alternatives for educational administration: lessons from abroad. *Leaders for America's Schools.* San Francisco: McCutchan, forthcoming.

Soutar, D.H. (1982). *An Overview of Management Development in Mining and Other Industries.* Paper presented at the American Institute of Mining, Metallurgical, and Petroleum Engineers, Dallas, TX.

Yankelovich, D. & Immerwahr, J. (1984, January/February). Putting the work ethic to work. *Society,* 58-76.

Descriptions of how principals function and conclusions as to the work of principals and superintendents may be found in:

Griffiths, D.E. (1987). Administrative theory. N. Boyan (Ed.). *The Handbook of Research on Educational Administration.* Chicago: Longman, Inc.

Griffiths, D.E. (1966). The School Superintendent. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education.

Clark, D. & Astuto, T. Paradoxical choice options in organizations. *Leaders for America's Schools.* San Francisco: McCutchan, forthcoming.

Hoyle, J.R., English, F.W., & Steffy, B.E. (1985). *Skills For Successful School Leaders.* Arlington, VA. American Association of School Administrators.

NAESP. (1984). *Standards for Quality Elementary Schools.* Arlington, VA. National Association of Elementary School Principals.

NAESP. (1986). *Proficiencies for Principals.* Arlington, VA. National Association of Elementary School Principals.

References to schoolboards and superintendents are detailed in:

School Boards. (1986). Washington: The Institute for Educational Leadership.

Ideas for the restructuring of schools and the roles of teachers and administrators are found in:

Time for Results: The Governors 1991 Report on Education. Section devoted to the work of the Task Force on Leadership and Management.

Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group. (1986). East Lansing: The Holmes Group, Inc.

A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. (1986). New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Patterson, J.L., Purkey, S.C., & Parlier, J.V. (1986). *Productive School Systems For A Nonrational World.* Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Crim, Shankee, & Greane. (1986, December). On the education of a teacher. *Innovator*, 18(3).

Shanker, A. (1987, January 18). Management creates sense of purpose. *Where We Stand, New York Times.*

2. What Public Schools Should Do

Ideas on the role of public schools in the preparation of school administrators are found in:

Peterson, K.D., & Finn, C.E., Jr. (1985). Principals, superintendents, and the administrator's art. *The Public Interest, 79,* 42-62. *Reprinted in Leaders for America's Schools.* San Francisco: McCutchan, forthcoming.

Recruitment of administrators was discussed in:

Goodlad, J.L. (1984). *A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Frasher and Frasher reviewed seven studies in which the performances of men and women school administrators were compared. They found either no sex differences or women received higher ratings.

Frasher, J.M., & Frasher, R.S. (1979). Educational Administration: A feminine profession. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 15(2), 1-13.*

Representation of blacks in school administration is discussed in:

Jackson, B.L. (1987). Education from a black perspective with implications for administrator preparation programs. *Leaders for America's Schools.* San Francisco: McCutchan, forthcoming.

The factors that should be taken into account in the selection of administrators are discussed in:

Miskel, C. (1983). The Practicing Administrator: Dilemmas, knowledge, and strategies for improving leadership. W.N. Hird (Ed.). *The Practicing Administrator: Dilemmas and Strategies,* 1-21.

The importance of assessment is discussed in:

NASSB Bulletin, 70 (486), 1-58.

A good example of a program designed to introduce ethnic minority secondary school students to careers in education is the Mentor in Education program. For information write:

Barbara Probst
New York Alliance for the Public Schools
32 Washington Place
New York City, New York 10003

4. What Universities Should Do

The main sources of criticisms of the study and practice of educational administration and the preparation of educational administrators are:

Achilles, C. (1984). Forecast: Stormy weather ahead in educational administration. *Issues in Education*, 2, 127-135.

Foster, W. (1987). Educational administration: a critical appraisal. *Leaders for America's Schools*. San Francisco: McCutchan, forthcoming.

Greenfield, T.B. (1987). Representing organization theory with a human face: The search for a human and humane understanding of administration. *Leaders for America's Schools*. San Francisco: McCutchan, forthcoming.

Griffiths, D.E. (1979). Intellectual turmoil in educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 25(3), 43-65.*

Peterson, K.D., & Finn, C.E., Jr. (1985). Principals, superintendents, and the administrator's art. *The Public Interest, 79,* 42-62. Reprinted in *Leaders for America's Schools*. San Francisco: McCutchan, forthcoming.

Shakeshaft, C. (1987). Women in educational administration: Implications for training. *Leaders for America's Schools*. San Francisco: McCutchan, forthcoming.

Cornett, L. (1985). Rethinking the selection and preparation of school principals. Paper presented to the National Governor's Association Task Force and School Leadership and Management, Little Rock.

Discussions of alternatives to current approaches to preparing educational administrators are found in:

Pohland, P.A. (1987). The return of the Mayflower: British alternatives to American Practice. *Leaders for America's Schools.* San Francisco: McCutchan, forthcoming.

Murphy, M. (1987). Alternatives for educational administration: Lessons from abroad. *Leaders for America's Schools.* San Francisco: McCutchan, forthcoming.

Other articles on the preparation of educational administrators include:

Daniel E. Griffiths. The professorship revisited. *Leaders for America's Schools.* San Francisco: McCutchan, forthcoming.

Hawley, W.D. Universities and the improvement of school management. *Leaders for America's Schools.* San Francisco: McCutchan, forthcoming.

Mackett, M., Frank, F., Abrams, P., & Nowakowski, J. Computers and educational excellence: Policy implications for educational administration. *Leaders for America's Schools.* San Francisco: McCutchan, forthcoming.

Bessoth, R. (1987). J. Culbertson (Trans.). School administration as a profession: A comparative study of educational development and training in six nations. *Leaders for America's Schools.* San Francisco: McCutchan, forthcoming.

Valverde, L.A. An exemplary preparation program: The co-operative superintendency program of the University of Texas. *Leaders for America's Schools.* San Francisco: McCutchan, forthcoming.

Blodgett, B. (1986). Casing the world economy. *TWA Ambassador,* 1986, March, 41-45.

Pitner, N. (1987). Graduate Preparation for the principal in California. *Leaders for America's Schools.* San Francisco: McCutchan, forthcoming.

Cooper, B.S. & Boyd, W.L. (in press). The evolution of training for school administration. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger, *Approaches to Administrative Training.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press. *Leaders for America's Schools.* San Francisco: McCutchan, forthcoming.

A paper with a suggested program and comprehensive bibliography is:

Achilles, C.M. (1987). Unlocking some mysteries of administration and administrator preparation: A reflective prospect. *Leaders for America's Schools.* San Francisco: McCutchan, forthcoming.

How the preparation program should reflect the research on gender difference is discussed in:

Shakeshaft, C. (1987). Women in educational administration: Implications for training. In *Leaders for America's Schools.* San Francisco: McCutchan, forthcoming.

The perspective on the education of Blacks for educational administration is given by:

Jackson, B.L. (1987). Education from the black perspective with implications for administrator preparation programs. The role of the practicing superintendent in the preparation of school superintendents. *Leaders for America's Schools.* San Francisco: McCutchan, forthcoming.

The generalizations concerning the test scores of people entering teaching and educational administration were drawn from three sources:

Combined SAT scores for college-bound high school seniors by intended field of study. (1986). *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century.* New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Griffiths, D.E., et al. (1986). *Teacher Education in Massachusetts: The Public Sector.* Boston: Board of Regents for Higher Education.

Guide to the Use of the Graduate Record Exam. (1985). Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 23.

A survey of certain UCEA doctoral programs is reported in:

Levan, F.D. & Norton, M.S. (1987). Doctoral studies of students in educational administration in UCEA member institutions. *Leaders for America's Schools.* San Francisco: McCutchan, forthcoming.

Wilson, K.A. (1987). A division of labor in the preparation of educational administration. *Leaders for America's Schools.* San Francisco: McCutchan, forthcoming.

Professional doctorates are discussed in:

Eells, W.C. (1963). *Degrees in Higher Education.* Washington: The Center for Applied Research in Education, 45-52.

Ideas for the professional model of preparation were drawn from:

Schein, E.H. (1972). *Professional Education.* New York: McGraw–Hill.

New theories of administration and organization are presented in:

Burrell, G. & Morgan, G. (1979). Sociological paradigms and organizational analysis. London: Heinemann.

Griffiths, D.E. (1987). Administrative theory. N. Boyan (Ed.). *The Handbook of Research on Educational Administration.* Chicago: Longman, Inc.

An example of the kind of research emerging from new theoretical approaches is:

MacPherson, R.J.S. (1986). Talking up and justifying organization: The creation and control of knowledge about being organized. *Studies in Educational Administration.* Armidale, NSW, Australia: Commonwealth Council for Educational Administra-

tion. *Leaders for America's Schools.* San Francisco: McCutchan, forthcoming.

Peterson's Guide to Graduate Study. (1986). Book 1 lists 505 institutions offering graduate courses in educational administration. They are distributed as follows:

216 – offer only master's degrees

484 – offer the master's plus other degrees

173 – offer doctorates (three offer only the doctorate: Claremont, Gonzaga, and International Graduate School)

21 – offer only the certificate of advanced study or educational specialist certificate.

The discussion of supply and demand for educational administrators is drawn from:

Bliss, J.R. Public school administrators in the United States: Analysis of supply and demand. *Leaders for America's Schools.* San Francisco: McCutchan, forthcoming.

One of the few papers on the clinical education of school administrators in existence is:

Peper, J.B. Clinical education for school superintendents and principals: The missing link. *Leaders for America's Schools* San Francisco: McCutchan, forthcoming.

5. What State Policy Makers Should Do

During the information gathering phase of the Commission's work, little enthusiasm was generated for this topic even though issuing licenses to people who meet certain standards is an important state function. In fact, the licensing programs enacted by states and implemented by colleges and universities were thought to constitute a national scandal. School administration licenses guarantee little except that the individual has collected graduate coursework over a period of years. Although the schooling of future generations is, in

the current rhetoric of public discourse, touted as our nation's most critical responsibility, it is difficult to think of another profession in which screening is so poorly executed.

Gousha, R., LoPresti, P.L., & Jones, A.H. Report on first annual survey of certification and employment standards for educational administrators. *Leaders for America's Schools.* San Francisco: McCutchan, forthcoming.

Gousha, R., LoPresti, P.L., & Jones, A.H. Mapping a dynamic field: Results from the second annual survey of certification and employment standards for educational administrators. *Leaders for America's Schools. San Francisco: McCutchan, forthcoming.*

Bliss, J.R. Public school administrators in the United States: Analysis of supply and demand. *Leaders for America's Schools.* San Francisco: McCutchan, forthcoming.

Commission members and the staff heard much criticism of professional development programs. Both content and process were said to be inadequate to the needs of contemporary and future administrators. Among the most serious criticisms were that the principles of adult learning were violated routinely, programs were discontinuous, fragmented, and of low quality; they required participants to be passive and were unconnected to the issues which administrators were engaged in resolving. In addition, content was criticized as impractical, not reflective of best practices and, often enough, simply erroneous. Two papers of interest are:

Peterson, Kent D. (1986, January). *The Inservice of American School Administrators: One View.*

Roland, Barth. (1986). *On Sheep and Goats. Leaders for America's Schools.* San Francisco: McCutchan, forthcoming.

Many good models of professional development exist in the United States. Mentoring is occurring within and across school districts. The Peer Assisted Leadership (PAL) program of the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development is but one example.

State and university sponsored academies for principals and superintendents exist in more than one-half the states. The professional associations sponsor many excellent programs including academies, conferences and assessment centers.

The principles of adult education which should guide professional development are well defined. School administrators want their learning experiences to be of high quality. They expect to be consulted about content and about the manner in which it is presented. They are active learners who learn from each other and from many other sources. They expect to learn both technical skills and broader conceptions and applications. They expect that programs will be efficiently presented in a well integrated manner. Participants also expect that they will be given ample opportunity to practice skills and to receive clear, specific feedback on their performance. Finally, participants expect to see a connection between experiences and both their own long range needs and the long range plans of their employers.

Roland Barth. (1985, April). *Principal Centered Professional Development.* Presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Chicago, IL.

List of Commissioned Papers

- Charles M. Achilles, "Unlocking some Mysteries of Administration and Administrator Preparation: A Reflective Prospect."
- Roland S. Barth, "On Sheep and Goats."
- Roland S. Barth, "Principal Centered Professional Development."
- Richard Bessoth, "School Administration as a Profession: A Comparative Study of Educational Development and Training in Six Nations."
- James R. Bliss, "Public School Administrators in the United States: An Analysis of Supply and Demand."
- Judith Chapman, "A New Conception of the Principalship: Decentralization, Devolution, and the Administration of Australian Schools."
- David L. Clark and Terry A. Astuto, "Paradoxical Choice Options in Organizations."

- Bruce S. Cooper and William L. Boyd, "The Evolution of Training for School Administration."
- William Foster, "Educational Administration: A Critical Approach."
- Richard Gousha, "Report on First Annual Survey of Certification and Employment Standards for Educational Administrators."
- Thomas B. Greenfield, "Representing Organizational Theory with a Human Face."
- William D. Greenfield, "Moral Imagination, Interpersonal Competence, and the Work of School Administrators."
- Daniel E. Griffiths, "The Professorship Revisited."
- Daniel E. Griffiths, "The Preparation of School Administrators.
- Willis D. Hawley, "Universities and the Improvement of School Management."
- Barbara L. Jackson, "Education From a Black Perspective With Implications For Administrative Preparation Programs", "The Role of the Practicing Superintendent in the Preparation of School Superintendents."
- Frederick D. Levan and M. Scott Norton, "Doctoral Studies of Students in Educational Administration Programs in UCEA Member Institutions."
- Muriel Mackett, Frederick Frank, Peter Abrams, and Jeri Nowakowski, "Computers and Educational Excellence: Policy Implications for Educational Administration."
- R.J.S. Macpherson, "Talking Up and Justifying Organization: The Creation and Control of Knowledge about Being Organized."
- Martha M. McCarthy, "The Professoriate in Educational Administration: Current Status and Challenges Ahead."
- Michael Murphy, "Alternatives for Educational Administration: Lessons from Abroad."

- M. Scott Norton, "National Survey of Departmental Organization in Educational Administration."
- John B. Peper, "Clinical Education for School Superintendents and Principals: The Missing Link."
- Kent D. Peterson, "The Inservice of American School Administrators: One View."
- Kent D. Peterson and Chester E. Finn, Jr., "Principals, Superintendents and the Administrator's Art."
- Nancy J. Pitner, "Graduate Preparation for the Principal in California."
- Paul A. Pohland, "The Return of the Mayflower: British Alternatives to American Practice."
- Charol Shakeshaft, "Women in Educational Administration: Implications for Training."
- Kenneth St. Clair, "A Proposal: Assuring the Supply of New Talent into the School Superintendency in Oklahoma."
- Leonard A. Valverde, "An Exemplary Preparation Program: The Cooperative Superintendency Program of the University of Texas."
- Kevin A. Wilson, "A Division of Labor in the Preparation of Educational Administrators."